

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The California Department of Corrections (CDC) proposes to construct a new condemned male inmate complex (CIC) on an approximate 40-acre site within the existing boundaries of San Quentin State Prison (SQSP) in Marin County, California. Marin County is in the San Francisco Bay Area north of the City of San Francisco. SQSP is bounded by Interstate 580 and the City of San Rafael to the north, U.S. Highway 101 and the City of Larkspur to the west, San Francisco Bay to the south, and the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge and the small private neighborhood of San Quentin Village to the east. The project site is located on the western end of the SQSP property adjacent to West Gate.

Condemned male inmates are legislatively mandated to be housed and ultimately executed at SQSP. Housing for 68 condemned male inmates was originally constructed in 1934 on the top of North Block. There are currently more than 600 condemned male inmates incarcerated at SQSP, and many of them are housed in facilities not designed for the housing of condemned inmates (see Chapter 3, Project Description). The condemned population continues to grow at an average rate of 25 inmates a year (BSA 2004).

The CIC would be devoted to the safe and secure housing of condemned inmates at SQSP and would provide 1,024 cells that could safely house 1,408 condemned male inmates. The complex would consist of semi-autonomous maximum-security facilities providing housing, service, and support space. The semi-autonomous facilities would be physically separated from each other by inner perimeter security (i.e., combination of buildings, fencing, and walls) and include a modified version of CDC's prototypical 180 Degree Housing Unit. Each facility would be designed and constructed to provide similar space and services including housing, outdoor recreation, laundry, administration, canteen, religious services, legal library, maintenance, and mental health treatment services.

The CIC would be separated from the main prison by an outer patrol road, security fencing, and an inner patrol road. The CIC security fencing would consist of double cyclone fences topped with barbed tape and a lethal electrified fence located between the double fences. High-mast lighting, a central kitchen, mental health services building, 2 facility program support services buildings, a complex services building, and correctional treatment center would be constructed within the CIC. These buildings would provide space for the required services and programs. Perimeter guard towers, a support services building, a visitor/staff processing center, a communications building, a central building maintenance facility, and parking would be located outside the secure perimeter of the CIC. The project would employ up to 648 people.

To provide CDC greater flexibility in the design of the CIC and to consider options to reduce the environmental impacts of the project, this Draft EIR evaluates the environmental effects of two design options for the CIC: a single-level design option (single-level option) and the stacked design option (stacked option). The single-level option would be approximately 25 feet tall and the stacked option would be about 44 feet tall. In general, these design options provide the same programs and services within CDC's prototypical 180 Degree Housing Unit, but would slightly differ in their design and facility layout. Please refer to Chapter 3, Project Description, for a more detailed description.

The Legislature has authorized \$220,000,000 for the design and construction of the proposed SQSP CIC. Construction of the CIC is expected to begin in September 2005 and would be completed in approximately 18-24 months. Occupancy of the CIC would occur in December 2007/January 2008.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1-1, located at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental impacts of the project, level of significance before mitigation, recommended mitigation measures, and the level of significance after the application of mitigation measures.

1.3 SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The extent of the geographic area that may be affected by implementation of the project varies depending on the resource under consideration. As discussed in Section 5.2 of this Draft EIR, 30 projects are completed, under construction, approved, or are proposed in the project region, representing 776 new dwelling units and 1.2 million square feet of commercial development. The project would result in significant cumulative impacts to visual resources, air quality, water supply and traffic. A discussion of impacts associated with cumulative development is provided in Chapter 5.2 (Cumulative Analysis).

1.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to include “areas of controversy known to the lead agency.” The following issues, in no order of importance, are the controversial issues known to CDC:

- Continued housing of condemned inmates on the project site.
- Traffic congestion along local roadways.
- Visual impacts (i.e., density, design, lighting) of the CIC.
- Some expressed desires to close the prison and redevelop the site with a different use.
- Provision of wastewater and water services and infrastructure to the site.
- Development of an alternative community (i.e. transit-oriented development) at SQSP.

1.5 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

1.5.1 NO PROJECT (NO DEVELOPMENT) ALTERNATIVE

Under this alternative no actions would be taken at the project site. No development of the project site would occur and existing facilities and uses (i.e., minimum security housing) would continue. Over time, the male condemned inmate population would increase and would continue to be housed at SQSP. As this population increases and capacity in existing facilities designated for these uses is exceeded, CDC would be required to relocate other general inmate populations housed at SQSP to other prison facilities in CDC’s statewide prison system and would infill condemned inmates into existing general population housing at SQSP. Because of the increased security risks associated with condemned inmates, it is likely that some upgrades to this housing would be required. These upgrades could include construction of special yards, installation of solid doors on cell fronts where structurally feasible, and construction of additional non-contact visiting areas. Installation of an electrified fence to provide additional security around the main prison perimeter at SQSP is physically infeasible. Structural considerations limit the ability to adequately upgrade facilities, and this alternative would result in continuing safety concerns to correctional officers and program staff and inefficient operations.

1.5.2 OFFSITE LOCATION ALTERNATIVE

Under the Offsite Location Alternative, existing general population prison operations would continue at SQSP. Therefore, minimum security inmates would continue to be housed at the project site. However,

the male condemned inmate population would be relocated to a new offsite facility. This alternative would involve the construction of a new CIC facility, support facilities, and associated infrastructure at an offsite location. A specific location has not been identified because, in part, the legislature has mandated that all male condemned inmates be housed at SQSP. For purposes of this analysis it is assumed that this facility would either be located near a major metropolitan area similar to SQSP's location, or it would be located in a relatively rural and remote area similar to several other CDC facilities.

Based on typical prison designs, under this alternative approximately 200 acres of land would be required to construct proposed facilities and related infrastructure to serve these facilities. A greater number of prison support facilities (i.e., administration, storage) would be required under this alternative because these services are currently being provided at the main SQSP facilities and are not within the proposed CIC. Similar to the No Project (No Development) Alternative, this alternative would not result in any new construction at SQSP; however, the existing facilities at SQSP would be backfilled with general population inmates. Similar to the CDC's intent for the project, under this alternative, SQSP would intend to operate at the existing budgeted capacity (i.e., 5,763 inmates); however, it is conceivable that this alternative could result in the housing of approximately 6,200 inmates (i.e., maximum design capacity); therefore, for comparison purposes, this analysis considers impacts of housing up to 6,200 inmates at SQSP and 1,408 inmates at an offsite location. Prior to implementation of this alternative, the CDC would need to receive legislative authorization to acquire, design, and build a new facility for condemned inmates.

1.5.3 SAN QUENTIN VISION PLAN/RELOCATION OF SQSP ALTERNATIVE

The San Quentin Vision Plan/Relocation of SQSP Alternative (vision plan alternative) would close the existing SQSP and relocate general population and reception center inmates to one or more new offsite locations. Based on Marin County's San Quentin vision plan, Marin County would develop a transit-oriented "sustainable" community that includes residential, retail, commercial, open space and park areas, and a transit center hub that provides bus, future rail and ferry services (Marin County 2003).

1.5.4 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The No Project (No Development) Alternative would be environmentally superior to the project. It would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impacts to visual resources, cultural resources, and water on the site. Further, it would result in no impacts to construction-related noise, biological resources, and erosion on the site. Although this alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the project, it would not meet the basic objectives of the project.

Although the Offsite Location Alternative would meet the project's basic objectives by providing safe and secure housing for the male condemned inmate population, it would be environmentally inferior to the project. This alternative would eliminate the project's significant and unavoidable visual and cultural resource impacts; however it could result in potentially significant and significant environmental impacts related to land use, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, public services and utilities and transportation, depending on its location. Further, implementation of this alternative would require an act of the legislature for authorization and funding. Therefore, even if this alternative were selected, it would be infeasible to implement because CDC does not have legal authority to approve it.

The San Quentin Vision Plan/Relocation of SQSP Alternative would be environmentally inferior to the project. Although this alternative would provide safe and secure housing for condemned inmates, it would require the relocation of the entire prison to offsite locations. As described above, an offsite location alternative would not be environmentally superior to the project because it would result in new potentially significant and significant impacts not associated with the project. Further, reuse of the SQSP

property would result in greater environmental impacts than the project with respect to land use, noise, air quality, transportation, and cultural resources. In combination with the relocation of existing SQSP, many of these impacts would be even greater. Finally, CDC does not have the legal authority to approve this alternative.

With respect to the 2 onsite alternatives, the single level design alternative would result in less visual impacts, but potentially greater impacts to cultural resources (if the residences and school house on the site are deemed to be significant). It also eliminates 57 onsite houses affordable to SQSP employees and important for the efficient operation of the prison. The stacked design alternative would have greater visual impacts than the single level design. It would have less effects to cultural resources (none would be affected) and it would retain the onsite homes. Because of the tradeoffs between these 2 onsite alternatives, neither is considered environmentally superior to the other. Both design options would meet project objectives.

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.1 VISUAL RESOURCES			
4.1-a: The project site is not visible from a State-designated scenic highway and does not support any visually significant scenic resources (i.e., trees and rock outcroppings). As a result the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any such resources. This would be a less-than-significant scenic view impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.1-b: Under the single level design option, CDC would construct buildings that would appear to be of similar size as adjacent existing prison facilities. These buildings would not substantially alter the daytime viewshed from the Corte Madera viewpoint because they would not interfere with the San Quentin Ridgeline, would not block views of the undeveloped areas north of the site, would not alter the existing architectural features of SQSP, and would not alter the form or quality of the viewshed. Therefore, this would be a less-than- significant visual impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.1-c: Because the project would not substantially alter nighttime lighting from the Corte Madera viewshed under the single-level design option, nighttime light and glare impacts would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.1-d: Under the single level design option, the CDC would construct buildings that are smaller and have less mass than existing buildings on the site. Diary Hill would be removed, exposing more of the existing buildings as seen from the Larkspur Ferry Terminal. While this is a change from current conditions, the project would be visually consistent with current conditions and the change would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.1-e: Because the project would not substantially alter nighttime lighting from the Larkspur Ferry Terminal viewshed under the single-level design option, nighttime light and glare impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.1-f: Under the stacked design option, CDC would construct relatively tall buildings along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay. These buildings, when viewed from the Corte Madera, viewpoint would add a new dominant feature in the overall viewshed that would not necessarily blend in with existing structures on the site. This would be a significant visual impact.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC will use paint and design elements that reflect the character of the exiting and older facilities to the degree feasible SQSP. • CDC will consult with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission on project design, and will incorporate design features and elements to the degree they are feasible. Factors that CDC will need to consider in feasibility will include cost, safety and security, maintenance, and programming requirements for inmates. <p>In general, mitigating design elements could include the use of paint in horizontal and vertical bands on the buildings to break up the visual massing of the buildings, use of paint and/or tile cast in concrete to simulate a similar roofline as existing SQSP buildings, and/or the use of other materials (i.e., metal sheeting) to create a visual dimension to the building facades. The details of the design elements that will ultimately be implemented will be decided during the final design process.</p> <p>While CDC will make its best effort to design facilities to reduce visual impacts, the project would nevertheless result in a substantial change in the viewshed.</p>	SU
4.1-g: Because of the distance of the project site from Corte Madera, and the presence of existing nighttime lighting sources at SQSP, the project would not substantially increase nighttime lighting sources in the area such that it would adversely affect nighttime views from this viewpoint. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant nighttime visual impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.1-h: Under the stacked design option, CDC would construct relatively tall buildings along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay. These buildings when viewed from the Larkspur Ferry Terminal viewpoint would add a new dominant feature in the overall viewshed and would block existing available views of the architecturally distinct SQSP. Buildings would be plain and blockish, and would not have the visual character of the old SQSP buildings. This would be a significant visual impact.	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU
4.1-i: Because the stacked design option would partially block nighttime views of the existing old SQSP buildings and would add a new lighting source to the site, this combination of factors would result in a significant effect on the nighttime viewshed from the Larkspur Ferry Terminal.	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU
4.1-j: Under the single level design option, the project would construct new facilities along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay. Although these facilities would not interfere with the San Quentin Ridgeline, would not block views of the undeveloped hillside areas north of the site, and would not block views of the existing SQSP cell blocks the project would introduce a new dominant structure to the viewshed. The structure would have plain institutional architecture. This would be a significant visual impact.	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU
4.1-k: Because the project would not result in substantial exposure to new nighttime lighting from the Larkspur ferry viewshed under the single level design option (because of limited ferry operations at night), nighttime light and glare impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.1-l: Under the stacked design option, the project would include new facilities along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay. These facilities would block a large part of the viewshed and would introduce a new dominant structure to the viewshed. This would be a significant visual impact.	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU
4.1-m: Although the project would not result in substantial exposure to new nighttime lighting from the Larkspur ferry viewshed under the stacked design option (because of limited ferry operations at night), nighttime light and glare impacts would be substantial and adverse due to the combination of increased lighting and view blockage from the taller structures. Therefore, this impact would be significant.	S	Same as 4.1-f.	SU
4.1-n: The single level design option would change the viewshed along Sir Frances Drake Boulevard along the north of the site (peek views to the site). All houses on the project site (57 homes) would be removed. Dairy Hill and scattered buildings in the middle ground of the viewshed would be removed. Low-lying prison facilities with plain, unremarkable architecture would be constructed. The background viewshed would be beneficially affected, because removal of Dairy Hill would open up views to the Bay. Foreground and middle ground views would be substantially altered by replacing the existing viewshed with prison facilities. This would be a significant impact.	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU
4.1-o: Nighttime lighting under the single level design option would alter the intensity of lighting on the site as well as the nighttime viewshed along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard north of the site. This change would be significant.	S	Same as 4.1-f.	SU
4.1-p: The proposed single level design option would change the viewshed along Sir Frances Drake Boulevard as drivers approach from the west. Dairy Hill, which dominates the viewshed, would be removed. Low-lying prison facilities with	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
plain, unremarkable architecture would be constructed. The background viewshed would be beneficially affected, because removal of Dairy Hill would open up views of the old SQSP buildings and the Bay. Foreground views would be substantially altered by replacing the existing viewshed with prison facilities. This is a significant impact.			
4.1-q: Because the intensity of nighttime lighting on the project site and the nighttime visual character would substantially change with implementation of the project, the single level design option would result in significant nighttime lighting impacts from the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (west) viewpoint.	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU
4.1-r: The proposed stacked design option would change the viewshed along Sir Frances Drake Boulevard along the north of the site (peek views to the site). Dairy Hill and scattered buildings in the middle ground of the viewshed would be removed. Mid-rise prison facilities with plain, unremarkable architecture would be constructed. Foreground and middle ground views would be substantially altered by replacing the existing viewshed with prison facilities. This is a significant impact.	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU
4.1-s: Nighttime lighting under the stacked design option would alter the intensity of lighting on the site as well as the nighttime viewshed along Sir Francis Drake Boulevard north of the site. This change would be significant.	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU
4.1-t: Under the stacked design option, the project would change the development characteristics of the site by placing large buildings in an organized pattern on the site. Because the project buildings would dominate the viewshed with large, unremarkable architectural character and would block some views of existing SQSP facilities and open water areas of San Francisco Bay, the project would result in a significant impact	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
on daytime views from the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (west) viewpoint.			
4.1-u: Because the intensity of nighttime lighting on the project the nighttime visual character would substantially change with implementation of the project (under the stacked design option), the project would result in significant nighttime visual impacts from the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (west) viewpoint.	S	Same as 4.1-f	SU
4.2 AIR QUALITY			
4.2-a: The BAAQMD emphasizes implementation of effective and comprehensive control measures rather than requiring a detailed quantification of construction emissions. The BAAQMD requires that all feasible control measures, which are dependent on the size of the construction area and the nature of the construction operations involved, shall be incorporated into the project design and implemented during all construction activities. Because the required control measures are not currently incorporated as an element of the project, the short-term construction emissions could result in or contribute to a violation of the air quality standards. As a result, this impact would be potentially significant.	PS	<p>In accordance with BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines (BAAQMD 1999), the following mitigation, which includes BAAQMD-recommended basic, enhanced, and optional control measures, shall be implemented to reduce construction generated emissions to a less-than-significant level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water all active construction areas at least twice daily or as often as needed to control dust. • Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard. • Pave, apply water three times daily or as often as needed to control dust, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites. • Apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers or water to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more). • Enclose, cover, water as needed, or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) as needed to control dust. • Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph. • Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent 	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>silt runoff to public roadways and to the bay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install wheel washers and/or gravel strips for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tire or tracks of all trucks and equipment before leaving the site. • Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph and dust is created. • Minimize unnecessary idling time. • Maintain properly tuned equipment. <p>In addition to the measures identified below, construction activities are also required to comply with all applicable BAAQMD rules and regulations, specifically Rule 8-3 regarding architectural coatings, Rule 8-15 regarding asphalt paving, Rule 11-2 regarding demolition, and Regulation 6 regarding particulate matter and visible emissions.</p>	
4.2-b: Daily emissions of ROG, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ would not exceed the BAAQMD's significance threshold, and therefore would not result in or contribute to concentrations that exceed or conflict with applicable standards and plans. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.2-c: According to the traffic analysis prepared for the proposed project, signalized intersections in the vicinity of the project site would be anticipated to operate at acceptable LOS with implementation of the proposed project (DKS 2004). In fact, under project conditions all signalized intersections are predicted to operate at a LOS of C or better (DKS 2004). Thus, implementation of the project would not be anticipated to result in or contribute to local CO concentrations that exceed the California 1- or 8-hour ambient air quality standards of 20 parts per million (ppm) and 9 ppm, respectively. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.2-d: Given that compliance with applicable standards are required for the construction and operation of land uses that may result in the emissions of TACs, the TAC emissions from the routine use of facilities in operations, both on and off the project site, are expected to be within established standards. As a result, stationary sources of toxic air emissions would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.2-e: The project would not include the long-term operation of an odorous emission source; however, construction of the project would result in diesel exhaust emissions from onsite diesel equipment. Such emissions would be quite intermittent in nature and would dissipate rapidly from the source. In addition, mobile diesel equipment would only be present onsite temporarily during construction operations. Thus, the construction of the project is not anticipated to result in the exposure of sensitive receptors(i.e., prison employee residences) to an objectionable odor source. As a result, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
4.3-a: The project would not substantially reduce the overall amount of wildlife habitat. Impacts on wildlife diversity and abundance would be minimal and the project would not substantially impede the movement of any wildlife species. Disturbed annual grassland and ornamental vegetation such as that found on the project site is common, both locally and regionally, and is not of special concern to resource agencies. The project's impact to existing vegetation and wildlife habitat on the project site would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.3-b: The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special-status plants or animals. No suitable habitat for these species would be removed or otherwise affected because no habitat that supports these species is present on the project site or in areas where offsite improvements would occur (i.e., water pipeline). This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.3-c: Operation of an electrified fence at SQSP would result in the death of an undetermined number of animals. The large majority of electrocutions would result in the death of birds, some of which are protected under MBTA and the Fish and Game Code. This impact would not eliminate any resident or migratory bird species and it is not expected to reduce species diversity in the project vicinity. Although not expected, it is possible that the local population of one or more native birds, protected by MBTA and the Fish and Game Code, could be substantially affected. Therefore, this would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	<p>Prior to approval of the project, CDC will consult with USFWS and DFG to determine a course of action that minimizes wildlife electrocutions to the extent feasible and compensates for impacts on native wildlife species. It is anticipated that this would be accomplished using the tiered mitigation approach developed as part of the Statewide Electrified Fence Project. The mitigation includes a three-tiered approach that minimizes and mitigates impacts to wildlife species at risk of electrocution. Consultation with USFWS and DFG under ESA and CESA is not proposed because no state or federally listed species or candidates for listing are considered at risk of electrocution. CDC is committed to developing and implementing the three tiers of mitigation outlined below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1: The first tier of mitigation measures are those designed to eliminate or reduce wildlife attractants near the prison perimeter by implementing specific maintenance and operation procedures. By making the perimeter less hospitable, wildlife will frequent this area less often, thus reducing their exposure to accidental electrocution. Tier 1 maintenance and operation procedures, developed specifically for SQSP, will be incorporated into a handbook and a training module to be used by CDC staff. • Tier 2: Second tier mitigation measures consist of both exclusion and deterrent devices. Tier 2 measures that will be installed at SQSP include a vertical netting system and anti-perching devices. CDC will install ¾-inch mesh 	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>vertical netting enveloping both sides of the lower section of the electrified fence, which would otherwise present the greatest danger to wildlife species at risk of electrocution. Anti-perching wires, which consist of 2- to 4- inch pieces of stiff wire connected to an aluminum base, will be strategically attached to the tops of perching sites in and near the perimeter. Once installed, this wire would reduce the ability of birds to perch near the electrified fence, thus reducing exposure to accidental electrocutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 3: The third tier of mitigation includes compensatory mitigation that will fully compensate for residual wildlife mortality impacts. A quantitative analysis will be completed to determine if habitat enhancement is required to offset the annual loss of migratory birds resulting from electrocution. Habitat enhancement will be developed and funded by CDC to offset, by improving opportunities for reproductive success, impacts to migratory birds affected by the project. Habitat enhancement can include property acquisition, management actions, habitat restoration, and habitat creation. The mitigation sites could include state, federal, or private lands located anywhere in California that supports a large percentage of the species at risk of electrocution at SQSP. 	
<p>4.3-d: Implementation of the project would result in the filling of a 0.2 acre ditch that provides a hydrological connection to San Francisco Bay. The filling of this potential Waters of the U.S. would be a significant impact.</p>	<p align="center">S</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorization for placement of fill in the ditch will be secured from USACE via the Section 404 permitting process, which could include compliance under the Nationwide Permitting Program (NWP) prior to project implementation and coordination with BCDC, the CDC and DFG shall be conducted as part of the process. • As part of the Section 404 permitting process, CDC shall comply with the NWP program requirements or a conceptual wetlands mitigation plan shall be developed by a qualified 	<p align="center">LTS</p>

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		wetland biologist. The acreage of Waters of the U.S. that would be removed will be replaced or restored/enhanced on a “no-net-loss” basis in accordance with USACE regulations. The mitigation plan will quantify the total jurisdictional acreage lost, describe creation/replacement ratios for acres filled, annual success criteria, potential mitigation sites, and monitoring and maintenance requirements. The plan will be prepared by a qualified wetland biologist pursuant to, and through consultation with the USACE and the other regulatory agencies, as applicable. Implementation of the plan would fully compensate for the loss of jurisdictional Waters of the U.S.	
4.4 LAND USE AND PLANNING			
4.4-a: The project would not be incompatible with onsite or offsite land uses and would not result in any physical barriers that would divide an established community. Further, the project would not result in any changed land use conditions in San Quentin Village. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.4-b: The project is consistent with all relevant BCDC policies. Although the proposed project would not provide access to the bay/shoreline, it is consistent with BCDC policy 1, which requires maximum feasible access unless inconsistent with public safety concerns. The project would also be consistent with BCDC policy 4 regarding minimizing visual impacts to the Bay; it would be designed to minimize visual impacts to the maximum degree feasible. There are no other applicable environmental land use plans or policies of agencies with jurisdiction over the project. The project would therefore have a less than significant impact on land use plans and policies.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.4-c: There are no habitat conservation plans applicable to the project or project area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
4.5-a: The project under either the single-level or the stacked design options would not alter or otherwise affect warehouse 2, 3, and 4 and tower 5. Therefore the project (either design option) would have no impact on these historic resources.	NI	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.5-b: The single-level design option would result in the removal of the schoolhouse. Because the schoolhouse appears eligible for listing as a historic resource in the CRHR, removal of this building would be a significant impact.	S	<p>Under the single level design option the schoolhouse building would be demolished and removed. If the design option is ultimately implemented, mitigation measures for reducing this impact could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the historical conditions at the site, • Recordation of the resource similar to the standards of the Historic Architectural Building Survey and Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) (i.e., photographing the site and preparation of a report that documents the history of the building), and • Submittal of the HABS/HAER documents to the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) and to the local historic preservation society. • Relocation of all or a portion of the schoolhouse building to an available area within the SQSP. The rear of the building is one and a half stories tall as a result of being built on a hillside. The bottom portion of this building would be severed if removed. This portion of the building, however, does not contribute to the overall architectural quality of the building. The architectural quality of the building is primarily conveyed on the front façade. 	SU

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		The recommended mitigation would appropriately document and record the conditions of the schoolhouse building. Further, relocation of the building would preserve the architectural features that potentially qualify this building for historic status. However, even with implementation of recommended mitigation, this impact would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level because the building would either be demolished and removed with no preservation, or the building, although relocated, would be removed from the neighborhood setting, which has contributed to its potential historical status. No other feasible mitigation is available. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.	
4.5-c: The single-level design option would remove 57 staff residences. The historic status of these residences is uncertain. CDC will consult with SHPO to determine whether these residences form a historic district. If it is determined that they form a historic district, their removal would be a significant impact. If they are not deemed to be a historic district by SHPO, the removal of these residences would be a less-than-significant historic impact.	S/LTS	Under the single level design option, 57 staff residences would be removed. If SHPO deems that these residences form an historic district, their removal would be a significant impact, and CDC would implement the same mitigation measures as under 4.5-b above. This recommended mitigation, if needed, would also appropriately document and record the conditions of the residences. If relocation of some or all of the buildings is possible, the features could be preserved, but they would not be within their same historic context (relocation of this many houses on other parts of SQSP is not possible due to lack of space) because they would be removed from their neighborhood. No other feasible mitigation is available. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.	SU/LTS
4.5-d: The stacked design option would not affect the schoolhouse or any of the staff residences. Therefore it would not affect any historically significant or potentially significant structures.	NI	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.5-e: Because project-related construction activities could disturb previously unknown, buried important cultural resources, this would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If earthmoving activities during construction uncover artifacts or unusual amounts of stone, bone, or shell, CDC will stop work in the general vicinity of the find and consult with a qualified archaeologist. If bone is uncovered and the bone appears to be human, California law requires that the County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission be notified. Construction personnel shall be alerted to the possibility of buried archaeological resources in the project area prior to construction activities, and shall be educated as to identification of archaeological artifacts. 	LTS
4.6 EARTH RESOURCES			
4.6-a: The project site is not located in a designated Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, nor are any active faults identified on the project site. Therefore, ground rupture would not be anticipated at the project site. The site is located in an area subject to strong ground shaking (magnitude 7 to 8), which could result in severe structural damage. Because the project would be designed in accordance with the most recent provisions of the California CBC including seismic design criteria for buildings, the project's seismic hazard impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.6-b: Although the project site is not located in a seismic hazard zone for liquefaction, localized areas in the southeast portion of the project could be subject to seismically induced liquefaction. Lateral spread could occur along shoreline areas of the project site where sand/silt fill material overlies bay mud and shallow groundwater is present. Further, construction of project facilities on bay mud could result in seismically induced ground failure and ground deformation. These impacts would be potentially significant.	PS	CDC will prepare design-specific geotechnical studies before preparation of final grading plans for the project site. These studies will delineate the areas potentially subject to liquefaction and seismic-related ground failure and would include subsurface exploration, soil sampling and laboratory testing of onsite earth materials. Buildings, facilities, or infrastructure proposed in these areas will conform to the design recommendations of the geotechnical engineer. Recommended geotechnical measures will address site grading, cut and fill, subdrainage, fill material quality, foundation type and design criteria, and other	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		geotechnical measures. Measures to reduce liquefaction and ground failure impacts could include the construction of deep foundations, installation of driven piles, and extra reinforcement of foundation slabs.	
4.6-c: Because CDC would be required to obtain a NPDES permit from the SWRCB, which identifies measures to prevent erosion impacts to the project site and San Francisco Bay, the project's erosion impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.6-d: The presence of weak, compressible soils that may be unsuitable for foundation support and/or that may contain debris could result in structural damage to proposed facilities. Further, corrosive soils on the site could degrade foundations and other project facilities. This would be a potentially significant impact.	PS	<p>CDC will prepare design-specific geotechnical studies before preparation of final grading plans for the project site. These studies will delineate areas on the project site that have compressible or corrosive soils. Facility designs will conform to the recommendations of the geotechnical engineer. The following grading and foundation measures could be implemented to reduce the project's compressible and corrosive soils impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal, conditioning, or treatment of compressible or unsuitable soils, • Importation or redistribution (i.e., Dairy Hill) of clean fill materials suitable for reuse as engineered fill, • Grading to provide suitably compacted soils to support planned building foundations, roadways and other structures, • Construction of shallow, spread-type footings where bedrock is either exposed or confirmed to be at shallow depths (after grading), • Structural reinforcement of building foundations, • Construction of deep building foundations (i.e., cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) concrete piles or driven piles) in the southeastern portion of the site where thick layers of 	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>highly compressible bay mud is present,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a structural mat foundation system would be possible as an alternative, if the lighter structures were designed as floating or partially compensated structures to minimize the bearing pressures on the subsurface soils, and/or • Application of protective coatings to concrete and steel bars to reduce the potential for corrosion. • Selection of materials (i.e., PVC pipe and concrete mix designs) that are resistant to the corrosive soils and installation of cathodic protection systems to reduce or eliminate the potential for corrosion. 	
4.6-e: Because the project site is not located in a seismic hazard zone for landslides and removal of Dairy Hill would minimize or eliminate the potential for landslides or slope instability on the project site, landslide potential would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.6-f: No buildings would be located within a wave run up zone of a 10-foot tsunami wave, the maximum expected at the site. Further, facilities (i.e., outer perimeter road and electrified fence) located in the anticipated wave run up zone would not be adversely affect during wave inundation. Because of the long recurrence interval of tsunami waves large enough to produce a wave run up at the project site (i.e., greater than 200 years), the potential for tsunami inundation would be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS			
4.7-a: Because construction workers could be exposed to hazardous materials present onsite during construction activities (i.e., demolition grading, trenching, excavation), and contamination in onsite soils and groundwater could create a significant environmental or health hazard if left in place, this would be a potentially significant hazard impact.	PS	<p>To avoid health risks to construction workers, the contractor will prepare a site Health and Safety Plan. This plan will outline measures that will be employed to protect construction workers and the public from exposure to hazardous materials during remediation, demolition, and construction activities. These measures could include, but would not be limited to posting notices, limiting access to the site, air monitoring, watering, and installation of wind fences. Development contractors will be required to comply with state health and safety standards for all demolition work. If necessary, this will include compliance with OSHA and Cal-OSHA requirements regarding exposure to asbestos and lead-based paint.</p> <p>To reduce or eliminate health and environmental risks associated with elevated concentrations of hazardous materials in onsite soils, CDC will implement the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detergent Plant. Prior to site grading and excavation of soils in the vicinity of the detergent plant, additional soil samples will be collected and analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbon content. If laboratory analysis indicates elevated levels of petroleum hydrocarbons, the findings will be forwarded to the RWQCB for their review. If the RWQCB indicates that the soils should be handled as a hazardous waste, excavated soils will be stockpiled on plastic sheeting. Further remediation, if necessary, and disposal of the soils will be conducted in accordance with State and federal guidelines. • Recycling and Salvage Program (RASP). Prior to site grading and excavation of soils, soils in the scrap metal and recycling area will be evaluated for unusual odors, 	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>visible discoloration, or other indications of soil contamination. If soils suspected of being contaminated are encountered, they will be stockpiled on plastic sheeting. Stockpiled soils will be sampled in accordance with RWQCB guidelines, and the findings will be forwarded to the RWQCB for review. Further remediation, if necessary, and disposal of the soils will be conducted in accordance with State and federal guidelines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wastewater Treatment Plant. Soils in each of the sludge ponds at the former WWTP will be excavated and stockpiled separately on plastic sheeting. The stockpiled soil will be sampled in accordance with RWQCB guidelines and analyzed for metals (total and soluble) using the California Waste Extraction Method, and petroleum hydrocarbons. If laboratory results indicate that the stockpiled material is considered to be a hazardous waste, the findings will be forwarded to the RWQCB for their review. Further remediation, if necessary, and disposal of the soils will be conducted in accordance with State and federal guidelines. <p>CDC will prepare a site plan that identifies necessary remediation activities appropriate for proposed land uses, including excavation and removal of onsite contaminated soils, and redistribution of clean fill material on the project site. The plan will include measures that ensure the safe transport, use, and disposal of contaminated soil and building debris removed from the site. In the event that contaminated groundwater is encountered during site excavation activities, the contractor will report the contamination to appropriate regulatory agencies, dewater the excavated area, and treat the contaminated groundwater to remove contaminants prior to discharge in the sanitary sewer system. The development contractors will be</p>	

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		required to comply with the plan and applicable local, state, and federal laws and the requirements of the Central Marin Sanitary Agency for dewatering discharge. The plan will outline measures for specific handling and reporting procedures for hazardous materials, and disposal of hazardous materials removed from the site at an appropriate offsite disposal facility. Analysis and mitigation measures addressing the potential release of hazardous materials into the atmosphere are addressed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, of this Draft EIR.	
4.7-b: Because construction contractors and SQSP personnel would be required to comply with all laws pertaining to the handling, transport, and storage of hazardous materials during construction and operation of the CIC, there would be a less-than-significant impact related to hazards to the public or the environment.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
4.8-a: Because the project would construct new stormwater drainage facilities that would adequately accommodate and convey project-related stormwater volumes, the project would have less-than-significant storm drainage impacts.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.8-b: Because the project site is not located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain under all tidal conditions, and adequate storm drainage facilities would be provided at the site, the project would not increase the potential for flooding on or off the project site. This would be a less-than-significant flooding impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.8-c: Project construction and operation activities could result in onsite erosion and degradation of the water quality of stormwater that enters San Francisco Bay. This would be a potentially significant water quality impact.	PS	CDC will prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) designed to reduce potential impacts to surface water quality through the construction and life of the project. The SWPPP will act as the overall program document	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		<p>to provide measures to mitigate significant water quality impacts associated with implementation of the project. The SWPPP will include specific and detailed Best Management Practices (BMPs) required to mitigate significant construction-related pollutants. These controls will include practices to minimize the contact of construction materials, equipment, and maintenance supplies (e.g., fuels, lubricants, paints, solvents, adhesives) with stormwater. The SWPPP will specify properly designed centralized storage areas that keep these materials out of the rain.</p> <p>The SWPPP will specify a monitoring program to be implemented by the construction site supervisor, and must include both dry and wet weather inspections. State personnel will conduct regular inspections to ensure compliance with the SWPPP. BMPs designed to reduce erosion of exposed soil may include, but are not limited to: soils stabilization controls, water for dust control, perimeter silt fences, placement of hay bales, and sediment basins. The potential for erosion is generally increased when grading occurs during the rainy season because disturbed soil can be exposed to rainfall and storm runoff. If grading must be conducted during the rainy season, the primary BMPs selected will focus on erosion control, to keep sediment on the site.</p>	
4.9 NOISE			
4.9-a: Construction activities would result in a substantial (i.e., 5 dBA, or greater) temporary increase in ambient noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses. A total of 57 existing onsite employee residences would be demolished under the single level design option (they would not be sensitive receptors) and retained under the stacked option	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor will be required to keep construction equipment tuned and properly muffled. • Noise generating construction activities will be limited to between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. Monday through Friday and between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. on weekends and legal holidays. 	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
(they would be sensitive receptors). Onsite residences and planned residences in Larkspur are within 3,000 feet of other staff residences on the SQSP site and would be exposed to construction noise, including the Larkspur residences if they are occupied before project construction. Activities occurring during the more noise-sensitive evening and nighttime hours may result in increased levels of annoyance and sleep disruption to occupants of these nearby dwellings. As a result, construction-generated noise would be considered a significant short-term impact.			
4.9-b: Although predicted blasting noise levels at on-site residential dwellings (stacked design option) are not anticipated to exceed the maximum noise level criteria of 129 dB peak, and 105 dBC, detectable increases in ambient noise levels could potentially occur, for brief periods of time. This impact would be potentially significant under the stacked design option but would be less than significant under the single level design option (Impact 4.9-b).	Stacked Design Option – PS Single Level Design Option – LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the stacked design option is selected, CDC will comply with Mitigation Measure 4.9-a, which limits construction activities to daytime hours, and a qualified blasting consultant shall be employed to ensure that the charge size, shot timing and cover material are sufficient to ensure that maximum peak linear noise levels do not exceed 129 dB, or a maximum noise level of 105 dBC at residences and at the adjacent school. 	LTS
4.9-c: Because of the uncertainties in shot sizes, timing delays, and number of holes, blasting would be a potentially significant short-term impact (stacked design option). Likewise, given the close proximity of employee housing (if retained) to the construction areas, ground-borne vibration levels associated with pile driving activities would also be a potentially significant short-term impact under the stacked but not single level, design option. Existing onsite employee housing, which are the sensitive receptors likely most affected by construction-generated groundborne vibration, would be demolished under the single level design option and retained under the stacked option.	Stacked Design Option – PS Single Level Design Option – LTS	For the stacked design option, advanced pile driving tests will be conducted and the pile driving specifications will be adjusted as needed to minimize potential damage to onsite residences. Blasting techniques will also be adjusted to limit potential damage. If construction activities produce vibration levels that damage state-owned houses at SQSP, CDC will examine any such damage and determine if repairs need to be made.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.9-d: Increases in vehicle traffic attributable to the project would result in a negligible and not perceptible increases (i.e., 0.1 dBA) in traffic noise. Increases in traffic noise would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.9-e: Because the outdoor speaker system would be used on an infrequent basis and for only brief periods of time, substantial increases in ambient noise levels at nearby offsite residences are not anticipated. However, given the proximity of proposed inmate housing to existing onsite employee housing (stacked, but not single level design option), increases in ambient noise levels at onsite noise-sensitive receptors could occur, resulting in increased potential of annoyance and sleep disruption. This would be a significant noise impact under the stacked design option but less than significant under the single level design option.	Stacked Design Option – PS Single Level Design Option – LTS	For the stacked design option, the following measures will be implemented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exterior public address system speakers shall be directed away from nearby noise-sensitive receptors, to the extent feasible, to reduce noise levels at nearby residences. Lease agreements for employees residing onsite shall incorporate an advisory notice that residential dwellings may be located within an area subject to high noise levels, including those attributable to the intermittent use of exterior PA systems. 	LTS
4.9-f: Predicted ambient interior noise levels would not exceed the State’s recommended daytime or nighttime noise compatibility standards for prisons of 70 and 45 dBA L_{eq} , respectively. This impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10 EMPLOYMENT, POPULATION AND HOUSING			
4.10-a: Implementation of the project would result in short-term construction jobs, permanent employment opportunities, and secondary employment opportunities in a region with a large labor pool. It is anticipated that the available workforce in the region and surrounding communities would provide a pool of employees that could adequately meet SQSP’s proposed employment needs without resulting in substantial in-migration of new residents to the region. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.10-b: Because project-related population growth would not stimulate any new development, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts, and the project-related population growth would be absorbed in growth projections of regional and local communities, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-c: The increased capacity of SQSP by 1,158 beds would be a less-than-significant impact because population growth in the prison is not, in itself, an environmental effect (although it has implications related to increased demand for public services such as water and wastewater, which are addressed in Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities).	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.10-d: Because no single county would receive a substantial number of new residents, and because the region offers a large housing base, the project would not substantially decrease the available housing stock in surrounding counties and would not result, in and of itself, in the construction of substantial new housing in the study area. Under the single-level design option, the project would result in the demolition and removal of 57 existing housing units that would not be replaced by CDC. Although project's displacement of housing for existing employees is an important issue in terms of the efficient and convenient operation of SQSP, it would not result in the substantial development of replacement housing elsewhere in surrounding counties. This impact would be less than significant. Under the stacked design option, no onsite housing displacement would occur. Under this option, the project's impact would also be less-than-significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.11 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES			
4.11-a: Because the Sheriff's Department anticipates that existing staff levels would be adequate to serve the project without substantially affecting their ability to provide services elsewhere, and response times to the project site would not increase, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on law enforcement services.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-b: Because the project would not substantially affect the SQSP Fire Station's ability to provide fire protection services at SQSP, and emergency response times would not substantially increase, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on fire protection services.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-c: Because CIC employees would be widely distributed throughout the region, it is anticipated that the project would not substantially increase school enrollment in any one school district such that it would require the construction of new facilities (i.e., classrooms) or schools. Further, if employment-related housing affected a capacity constrained school district, it is likely that school mitigation fees would be collected in association with the housing. This would be a less-than-significant school impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-d: The project-related wastewater flows would not exceed existing available conveyance capacity of the SQSP pump station and the existing force main pipelines. Further, the CMSA WWTP has ample available capacity to treat project-related wastewater flows. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on wastewater facilities.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.11-e: Because the CMSA WWTP and the Redwood Landfill would have adequate capacity available to handle the increase in sludge generated by the project, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-f: Because SQSP would continue to take all measures to comply with existing monitoring requirements of CMSA and the RWQCB, and the project would not substantially change the characteristics of the wastewater conveyed to the CMSA, the project would have a less-than-significant-impact on wastewater quality.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-g: At budgeted capacity the project is estimated to increase water demands by 76 AFY. Because this water demand would not exceed MMWD's threshold for significant water supply impacts (i.e., 100 AFY), this would be a less-than-significant impact. At maximum capacity the project would increase demand by 227 AFY. This would exceed MMWD water demand thresholds and would further substantially contribute to MMWD's operational yield shortfall. This would be a significant impact.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SQSP will reduce its overall demand for water by (1) restricting the total number of toilet flushes per day per inmate at the CIC and (2) decreasing the gallons-per-flush by using an automated flush valve. Automated flush valves will be installed on the 1,024 toilets in cells at the CIC. These valves will be used to regulate the frequency of toilet flushes, reducing the potential number of flushes per day by approximately 50%. In addition, the flush valves will use only 1.9 gallons per flush. These improvements are estimated to result in a water savings of approximately 20-60 AFY. The project's water demands would be reduced to 167 to 207 AFY, which is still above MMWD's water demand threshold. No additional mitigation is available to reduce water demands. This would be a significant and unavoidable impact. 	SU
4.11-h: Because the project could contribute to the need for MMWD to construct new water supply facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts to several resources, the project's contribution to this impact would be potentially significant.	PS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MMWD's potential construction of new water supply facilities would likely have significant effects on the environment. Mitigation for many of those impacts will be identified by MMWD during its environmental review process. The decisions regarding mitigation measures will be made by MMWD and affected regulatory agencies. If new water entitlements are required for CIC, CDC will be required 	<p>SU</p> <p>The impacts of the proposed desalination plant have not been definitively</p>

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		to pay correction fees to MMWD. As one of many users of MMWD water, it is presumed that these connection fees, as well as monthly service fees, would translate CDC's fair share contribution to MMWD's construction of new region-serving infrastructure, including mitigation.	determined, but clearly have the potential to be significant. Without additional information it can only be concluded that some impacts may be significant and unavoidable. If feasible mitigation which would be adopted by MMWD, is not effective in reducing impacts to a less-than-significant level, then the project's contribution to the need to construct the desalination plant would result in significant and unavoidable impacts

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.11-i: Because the proposed improvements to the existing water distribution system would not adversely affect the provision of water to existing SQSP facilities, and additional reliability and redundancy in the water supply system would be provided, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-j: The existing water storage tank would be able to provide adequate water storage for operational, fire, and reserve flows with implementation of the project. Further, the project would provide additional reliability and redundancy in the water supply system. Although water storage capacity would not be available to meet all water demands (i.e., operational, fire, and reserve) when half of the existing 3.0 million gallon water storage tank is taken offline, events that would require use of all available water storage capacity have never occurred at SQSP. Further, the project would not increase the potential frequency of these events. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect existing water storage facilities. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-k: Because the project would not adversely affect landfill capacity, would not result in the construction of new solid waste disposal facilities, or impair waste management disposal services, this impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-l: Although the project would increase demand for electricity, the project's demands would not exceed existing available electrical supplies and the project would not adversely affect PG&E's ability to provide electrical services to its existing customers. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on electricity services.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

<p align="center">Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures</p>			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
4.11-m: Although the project would increase demand for natural gas supplies at the site, the project's demand would not exceed existing available supplies. Further, staff of PG&E have indicated that they would be able to serve the project. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on natural gas services.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-n: Although the project would require upgrades to existing PG&E transmission lines and a new substation onsite, PG&E has indicated that they can complete the necessary improvements and that these improvements would not affect their ability to serve SQSP or their existing customers. Therefore, this would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.11-o: Because the project would not adversely affect the provision of natural gas services at SQSP, and staff of PG&E have indicated that capacity is available in their existing gas distribution line, this would be a less-than-significant impact	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.12 TRANSPORTATION			
4.12-a: With implementation of the project, all study intersections would operate at acceptable levels or under significance thresholds of the jurisdictions in which the intersections are located with the exception of the Main Street/I-580 eastbound on/off ramp intersection. The addition of project-related traffic to this intersection would decrease the LOS from LOS C to LOS E during the weekday midday peak hour. This would be a significant traffic impact.	S	<p>To achieve acceptable LOS under the project conditions at the Main Street/I-580 eastbound on/off-ramp intersection, implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDC will contribute its fair-share contribution to the installation of a new traffic signal at the Main Street/I-580 eastbound on/off-ramp intersection. Implementation of this measure would allow this intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS under the weekday a.m., weekday midday, weekday p.m., and weekend midday peak hours. Currently, the City of San Rafael has no improvements planned for this intersection as part of its transportation improvement program. However, the City is in the process of establishing 	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1-1 Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures			
Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
		a traffic fee mitigation program that would collect monies that would fund transportation improvements to roadways within their jurisdiction. CDC will coordinate with the City of San Rafael to determine the project's fair-share contribution to the funding of the installation of a traffic signal at the Main Street/I-580 eastbound on/off-ramp intersection.	
4.12-b: Because project-generated construction trips could substantially affect the operation of local roadway intersections, this would be a potentially significant construction-related traffic impact.	PS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction employee arrival and departure schedules shall be staggered so they do not coincide with adjacent street peak hours (7:00 AM – 9:00 AM, and 4:00 PM – 6:00 PM). The long term traffic improvements referenced in 4.12-a will be completed before the period of peak construction. This improvement would result in the installation of traffic signals at the Main Street/I-580 on/off ramps intersection (see 4.12-a). 	LTS
4.12-c: Because the project-generated transit trips would not be expected substantially increase load factors on existing transit vehicles, this would be a less-than-significant public transit impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.12-d: Although the project would increase demands for parking by a maximum of 52 spaces, the project would increase the number of parking spaces at SQSP by approximately 54 spaces. Therefore, the project would not affect existing parking supplies. This would be a less-than-significant impact.	LTS	No mitigation is necessary.	LTS
4.12-e: Although some (i.e., 369 spaces) designated parking spaces would be available for construction vehicles during the project construction period, it is unknown at this time whether all construction vehicles would be able to be accommodated on the project site or at SQSP. Because the project's construction parking demands would exceed available parking supplies, this would be a significant impact.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All parking will be accommodated on site or at designated offsite areas designated for such uses (i.e., garages, lots). Construction employees will be instructed where acceptable SQSP designated parking locations are located. If necessary, parking management practices such as valet or stacked parking onsite, or offsite parking with shuttles to and from the site will be implemented. 	LTS

NI = No Impact B = Beneficial LTS = Less Than Significant PS = Potentially Significant S = Significant SU = Significant and Unavoidable